

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 24, 2006, claims 1, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27 and 30 are amended, claims 37-43 are added and claims 2, 3, 33 and 34 are canceled. Claims 1, 4-32 and 35-43 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

In reviewing the application file, the undersigned has noted that the appropriate initialed Form PTO-1449 in response to the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on July 30, 2001 has not been received by Applicant. The Examiner is therefore requested to return a copy of the initialed Form PTO-1449 to the undersigned as soon as possible.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ludwig et al. (UK Patent Application GB 2282506). In this regard, Applicant notes that the cover sheet of UK Patent Application GB 2282506 indicates a publication date of April 3, 1995, for the application.

The Examiner maintains that in Ludwig et al., the icons are considered as a position-coding pattern and refers to Fig. 41 and box or icon 205. However, Applicant disagrees as nothing in Ludwig et al. discloses or describes the icons as having, or being, a position-coding pattern. In particular, there is nothing in Ludwig et al. that discloses or suggests that the icons are position-coding patterns having sufficient resolution to define a track of a drawing device. This subject is disclosed at paragraphs [040] through [047] of the present application, and in particular, paragraphs [0045] through [0047]. For example, paragraph [045] describes, "When

the user draws on the printed-out area 69 with the device 71, an application in the user's personal computer 67 *can determine what was drawn* (e.g., message 73) based on the position information forwarded by the device (emphasis added).” What is drawn is “a track of the drawing device 71”.

It is noted that while it may be possible that the system of Ludwig et al. keeps track of where icons are positioned in the display area, how this is done is not described in Ludwig et al. What is described regarding In Box icon 205 is that it is a picture of an envelope in a dog's mouth by which a user is made aware that incoming Email messages are present in his Mail (page 52, lines 1-12). When the user has no unread messages in his Mail, icon 205 changes to show a picture in which a dog's mouth has no envelope. There is, however, nothing disclosed or suggested in Ludwig et al. that indicates that, for example, icon 205 is, or contains, a position-coding pattern, which pattern has sufficient resolution to define a track of drawing device, such as is the case for the position-coding pattern of the present application.

To expedite prosecution, dependent claims 2 and 3 are cancelled and independent claim 1 has been amended to delineate, *inter alia*:

creating a first information object comprising a partial area of a virtual pixel area into which a plurality of users can write information and from which the plurality of users can read information, **said first information object including a position-coding pattern having sufficient resolution to define a track of a drawing device; ...**

Related language has been added to each of independent claims 17 and 26. As noted above, Ludwig et al. does not disclose or suggest a position-coding pattern having sufficient resolution to define a track of a drawing device. Therefore, amended independent claims 1, 17 and 26 are patentable over Ludwig et al.

It is noted also that in the present Office Action, the Examiner has never made the requisite factual findings or pointed out any differences between the invention recited in dependent claim 34 vis-à-vis Ludwig et al. However, 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2) *Rejection of Claims* indicates that “the particular part relied on must be designated”, and requires that “[t]he pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, **must be clearly explained** and each rejected claim specified.”

To additionally expedite prosecution, dependent claims 33 and 34 have been cancelled and independent claim 30 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

displaying the portion of the graphical image to a first user included in the plurality of users together with a position-coding pattern, detectable by an optical sensor, in a known relationship to the portion of the graphical image;
receiving a modification of the portion of the graphical image from the first user comprising a set of coordinates generated as a result of the first user moving an optical sensor over the position-coding pattern...

Amended independent claim 30 is substantially a combination of original claims 30, 33 and 34. A review of Ludwig et al. evinces, *inter alia*, that there is no disclosure of a step of “receiving a modification of the portion of the graphical image from the first user comprising a set of coordinates generated as a result of the first user moving an optical sensor over the position-coding pattern” (from original dependent claim 34). Therefore, amended independent claim 30 is patentable over Ludwig et al.

In view of the above, the allowance of amended independent claims 1, 17, 26 and 30, as well as of dependent claims 4-16, 18-25, 27-29, 31, 32, 35 and 36, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

AMENDMENT TO CLAIM 27 AND NEW CLAIMS

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that original claim 27 [removing the message after a certain period of time] was inherent in Ludwig et al. "because the arrival of new information will be changing the location of old information". While Applicant does not agree that the recitations of original claim 27 is inherent in Ludwig et al., to expedite prosecution, claim 27 has been amended to recite:

the message has associated therewith a fixed time period in which the message will remain in said position on the virtual area, the method further comprising removing the message from said position on the virtual area after elapse of said fixed time period.

Since the arrival of new information would **NOT** change the location of old information during a fixed time period in which the old information is set to remain on the display area, amended claim 27 is patentable over Ludwig et al. for reasons in addition to the reason as to why amended independent claim 26 is patentable over Ludwig et al.

New claims 37, 39 and 42, similar to amended claim 27, are added and depend respectively from amended independent claims 1, 17 and 30. Claims 37, 39 and 42 are patentable over Ludwig et al. for the same reason that amended claim 27 is patentable over Ludwig et al.

New claims 38, 40, 41 and 43 respectively depend from claims 37, 39, 27 and 42. Claims 38 recites:

visually indicating to all users of the electronic information service, via a non-numerical graphical representation, elapsing of said fixed time period in which the virtual pixel area will remain updated utilizing the second information object.

Claims 40, 41 and 43 have similar recitations.

This subject matter is disclosed at paragraph [035] of the present application. There is nothing disclosed or suggested in Ludwig et al. that a non-numerical graphical representation is used to indicate elapsing of a fixed time period, let alone the fixed time period that is recited in claims 27, 39, 27 and 42. Therefore, claims 38, 40, 41 and 43 are patentable over Ludwig et al. for reasons in addition to the reasons already noted above.

In view of the above, the allowance of new claims 37-43 is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise (Reg. No. 34,523) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East, P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant


MKM/EJW/vd